UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,721	12/19/2001	Helmut Wassermann	HAMMON-002	1611
	7590 05/03/2007 VID, LITTENBERG,	EXAMINER		
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK			PRONE, CHRISTOPHER D	
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	05/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

				E		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/936,721	WASSERMANN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Christopher D. Prone	3738			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE is used to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. To period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be til vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Fe	ebruary 2007.				
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)[	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) 🔀	Claim(s) 29 and 67-106 is/are pending in the a	pplication				
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	•				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) 29 and 67-106 is/are rejected.			•		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s)are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	•			
Applicati	on Papers		•			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
• —	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	,			
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	ı)-(d) or (f).			
۵/۱	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ion No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	, ,				
	application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachmen	t(s)	•	•			
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/8/07</u> .	6) Other:	oton reproduction			

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/20/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the Examiner does not have any problem in interpreting exactly what the language of the claims intends and that the Examiner's position is not that one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand how to define the shape of the present apparatus based upon this formula, but that it is a broad limitation which covers "almost any shape. The applicant contends that this does not render the claim indefinite. However the current condition of the claim renders it indefinite because one cannot determine the scope of the claim. The formula is so broad that it can be manipulated to form numerous shapes, which are not supported by the specification.

The applicant is advised to remove the formula from the claim ad to add in a structural element to better overcome any references of record as discussed in the interview had on 8/24/06 with application 10/101652.

The applicant is also encouraged to file the terminal disclaimer to overcome the Double Patenting rejection.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/936,721

Art Unit: 3738

Claims 29 and 67-106 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The formula:  $F(x) = A + A_1x + A_2x^2 + A_3x^3 + A_4x^4 + A_5x^5 + A_6x^6$  in claim 29 represents broad general shape which can be modified to represent almost any shape, which renders the claim indefinite. From this equation one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

# **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 29, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 81, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, and 97 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable

Application/Control Number: 09/936,721

Art Unit: 3738

over claims 1, 2, 38, 39, 50, 124, 127, and 137 of U.S. Patent No. 7,131,996. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the equation in independent claim 29 of the current application is so broad that it encompasses any generic shape, which is included by application 10/101,652.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Prone whose telephone number is (571) 272-6085. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Fri 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3738

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher D Prone Examiner

Art Unit 3738

ري CDP

> CORRINE McDERMOTT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700